Adaptive Delay-Tolerant Distributed Space-Time Coding Based on Adjustable Code Matrices for Cooperative MIMO Relaying Systems

Tong Peng, Rodrigo C. de Lamare
Communications Reasearch Group, Department of Electronics
University of York, York YO10 5DD, UK
Email: tp525@ohm.york.ac.uk; rcdl500@ohm.york.ac.uk

arXiv:1405.4571v1 [cs.IT] 19 May 2014

***Abstract*—An adaptive delay-tolerant distributed space-time coding (DSTC) scheme that exploits feedback is proposed for two-hop cooperative MIMO networks. Maximum likelihood (ML) receivers and adjustable code matrices are considered subject to a power constraint with a decode-and-forward (DF) cooperation strategy. In the proposed delay-tolerant DSTC scheme, an adjustable code matrix is employed to transform the space-time coded matrix at the relay nodes. Least-squares (LS) algorithms are developed with reduced computational complexity to adjust the parameters of the codes. Simulation results show that the proposed algorithms obtain significant performance gains and address the delay issue for cooperative MIMO systems as compared to existing delay-tolerant DSTC schemes.**

***Index Terms*—Distributed space-time coding, delay-tolerant space-time codes, MIMO systems.**

I. Introduction

Cooperative multiple-input and multiple-output (MIMO) systems can obtain diversity gains by providing copies of the transmitted signals with the help of relays to improve the reliability of wireless communication systems [1]-[9]. The basic idea behind these cooperative relaying systems is to employ multiple relay nodes between the source node and the destination node to form a distributed antenna array, which can provide significant advantages in terms of diversity gains. Several cooperation strategies that exploit the links between the relay nodes and the destination node such as amplify-and-forward (AF), decode-and-forward (DF), compress-and-forward (CF) [1] and distributed space-time coding (DSTC) schemes [2], [5] that employ space-time codes [5], [10] have been extensively studied in the literature. A key problem that arises in the cooperative MIMO systems and which degrades the performance such systems is the existence of delays between the signals that are space-time coded at the relays and decoded at the destination.

Delay-tolerant Space-Time Coding (DT-STC) schemes [11]-[15] which address the delay between the relay nodes have been recently considered for distributed MIMO systems. Extending the distributed threaded algebraic space-time (TAST) codes [11], Damen and Hammons designed a delay-tolerant coding scheme in [12] by the extension of the Galois group and field employed in the coding scheme to achieve full diversity and full rate. A further optimization which ensures that the codes in [12] have full diversity with the minimum length and lower decoding complexity is presented in [13]. The authors of [14] propose delay-tolerant distributed linear convolutional STCs which can maintain the full diversity property under any delay profile. In [15], a precoder based on the linear constellation precoder (LCP) design is employed to construct an optimal DT-STC to achieve the upper bound of the error probability.

In the literature so far, two basic configurations of distributed space-time schemes have been reported: one in which the coding is performed independently at the relays [6], [7] and another in which coding is performed across the relays [12], [15]. It is not clear the key advantages of these schemes and their suitability for situations with delays. In addition, the work on delay-tolerant space-time codes has focused on schemes that do not employ feedback to improve the performance of the systems. Strategies to exploit feedback and improve the design of distributed space-time coding schemes remain unexplored.

In this paper, we propose an adaptive delay-tolerant distributed space-time coding scheme that employs feedback and devise a design algorithm for cooperative MIMO relaying systems with delays at the relay nodes. A delay-tolerant adjustable code matrices optimization (DT-ACMO) algorithm based on the the ML criterion subject to constraints on the transmitted power at the relays for different cooperative systems is presented. Adaptive optimization algorithms using least-squares (LS) estimation method are developed for the DT-ACMO scheme in order to release the destination node from the high computational complexity of the optimization process. In particular, we consider network configurations in which the coding is performed across the relays and independently at the relays to study existing and the proposed delay-tolerant distributed space-time coding scheme. We study how the adjustable code matrix affects the DSTBC during the encoding process and how to optimize the adjustable code matrices by employing an ML detector.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II introduces two different types of two-hop cooperative MIMO systems with multiple relays applying the DF strategy and DSTC schemes. In Section III the proposed optimization algorithm for the adjustable code matrix is derived, and the results of the simulations are given in Section IV. Section V gives the

conclusions of the work.

II. Cooperative MIMO System Model



Fig. 1. Cooperative MIMO system model with an arbitrary number of antennas at the relays and n_r relay. nodes

We consider a cooperative communication system, which consists of one source node, n_r relay nodes (Relay 1, Relay 2, ..., Relay n_r), and one destination node as shown in Fig. 1. A two-hop cooperative MIMO system with all nodes employ N antennas and each of them can either transmit or receive at one time. We consider two types of system configurations in this paper, one is called the multiple antenna systems (MAS) configuration which employs relay nodes with $B = N$ antennas, and another one is called the single antenna systems (SAS) configuration which employs relay nodes with $B = 1$ antenna. A delay profile $\boldsymbol{\Delta} = [\delta_1, \delta_2, ..., \delta_{n_r}]$, where δ_k denotes the relative delay of the signal received from the kth relay node as a reference to the earliest received relay signal. Let $\boldsymbol{s}[i]$ denote the transmitted information symbol vector at the source node, which is derived as $\boldsymbol{s}[i] = [s_1[i], s_2[i], ..., s_N[i]]$, and has a covariance matrix $E\big[\boldsymbol{s}[i]\boldsymbol{s}^H[i]\big] = \sigma_s^2 \boldsymbol{I}_N$, where σ_s^2 is the signal power which we assume to be equal to 1. The source node broadcasts $\boldsymbol{s}[i]$ from the source to n_r relay nodes as well as to the destination node in the first hop, and all the relay nodes can detect the received symbol vectors with no errors.

Since the DF protocol is employed at the relay nodes, the received symbols are detected and re-encoded at each relay node prior to transmission to the destination in the second hop. We first consider the kth relay node in MAS, the $N \times 1$ signal vector $\boldsymbol{s}[i]$ will be re-encoded by an $N \times T$ DSTC scheme $\boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{s})$, multiplied by an $N \times N$ adjustable code matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_k[i]$ generated randomly [6], and then forwarded to the destination node. The relationship between the kth relay and the destination node can be described as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{R}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i] =& \boldsymbol{G}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{M}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i] \\ &+ \boldsymbol{N}_{R_k D}[i],\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{G}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i]$ denotes the $(\delta_{max} + N) \times N$ delayed version of the channel matrix between the kth relay node and the destination node, and $\boldsymbol{M}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i]$ is the $N \times T$ DSTC scheme. $\boldsymbol{N}_{R_k D}[i]$ stands for the noise matrix at the destination node with variance σ_d^2. The $(\delta_{max} + N) \times T$ received symbol matrix $\boldsymbol{R}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i]$ in (1) can be written as a $(\delta_{max}+NT)\times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{r}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i]$ given by

$$\boldsymbol{r}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i] = \boldsymbol{\Delta}_k \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i] + \boldsymbol{n}_{R_k D}[i], \tag{2}$$

where the $N(\delta_{max} + T) \times NT$ delay profile matrix $\boldsymbol{\Delta}_k = [\boldsymbol{0}_{\delta_k \times N}; \boldsymbol{I}_N; \boldsymbol{0}_{(\delta_{max}-\delta_k)\times N}]$ at the kth relay nodes is considered. The block diagonal $NT \times NT$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]$ denotes the equivalent adjustable code matrix and the $NT \times N$ matrix $\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]$ stands for the equivalent channel matrix which is the DSTC scheme $\boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{s})$ combined with the channel matrix $\boldsymbol{G}_{R_k D_{MAS}}[i]$. The $N(\delta_{max} + T) \times 1$ equivalent noise vector $\boldsymbol{n}_{R_k D}[i]$ generated at the destination node contains the noise parameters.

In SAS, only 1 antenna is employed at each relay node and the $n_r \times T$ DSTC scheme $\boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{s})$ is encoded across all the relay nodes. At the kth relay node, the $1 \times T$ code vector $\boldsymbol{m}_k(\boldsymbol{s})$ denotes the kth row in $\boldsymbol{M}(\boldsymbol{s})$ which is allocated. The received signal matrix from the kth relay node at the destination node can be described as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{R}_{R_k D_{SAS}}[i] =& \boldsymbol{g}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{R_k D_{SAS}}[i](\boldsymbol{\phi}_{k_{SAS}}[i] \cdot \boldsymbol{m}_{R_k D_{SAS}}[i]) \\ &+ \boldsymbol{N}_{R_k D}[i],\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $\boldsymbol{g}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{R_k D_{SAS}}[i]$ denotes the $(\delta_{max}+N)\times 1$ delayed version of the channel vector between the kth relay node and the destination node, and $\boldsymbol{\phi}_k[i]$ is the $1 \times T$ adjustable code vector. $\boldsymbol{N}_{R_k D}[i]$ stands for the noise matrix with variance σ_d^2. The $(\delta_{max} + N) \times T$ received symbol matrix $\boldsymbol{R}_{R_k D_{SAS}}[i]$ in (3) can be written as a $(\delta_{max}+NT)\times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{r}_{R_k D_{SAS}}[i]$ given by

$$\boldsymbol{r}_{R_k D_{SAS}}[i] = \boldsymbol{\Delta}_k \boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i] + \boldsymbol{n}_{R_k D}[i], \tag{4}$$

where the block diagonal $N \times N$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]$ denotes the diagonal equivalent adjustable code matrix and the block diagonal $NT \times N$ matrix $\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]$ stands for the equivalent channel matrix. The $N(\delta_{max}+T)\times 1$ equivalent noise vector $\boldsymbol{n}_{R_k D}[i]$ generated at the destination node contains the noise parameters.

After rewriting the received vectors in (2) and (4) we can consider the received symbol vector at the destination node as a $(T+1)N \times 1$ vector. Therefore, the received symbol vector for MAS and SAS can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{r}_{MAS}[i] &= \boldsymbol{D}_{D_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i] + \boldsymbol{n}_D[i], \\ \boldsymbol{r}_{SAS}[i] &= \boldsymbol{D}_{D_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i] + \boldsymbol{n}_D[i],\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where the $N(\delta_{max} + T + 1) \times N$ block diagonal matrices $\boldsymbol{D}_D[i]$ in MAS and SAS denotes the channel gain matrix of all the links in the network. We assume that the coefficients in all channel matrices are independent and remain constant over the transmission. The $N(\delta_{max}+T+1)\times N$ noise vector $\boldsymbol{n}_D[i]$ contains the equivalent received noise vector at the destination node, which can be modeled as complex Gaussian random cariables with zero mean and covariance σ_d^2.

III. Delay-Tolerant Adjustable Code Matrix Optimization for Delayed DSTCs

In this section, we propose the design of a delay-tolerant adjustable code matrix optimization (DT-ACMO) strategy with ML receivers for DSTC schemes in MAS and SAS. An adaptive recursive least square (RLS) algorithm [24] for determining the adjustable code matrices with reduced complexity is devised. The adjustable code matrix is computed at the destination node and obtained by a feedback channel. It is worth to mention that the code matrices are only used at the relay node so the direct link from the source node to the destination node is not considered here for simplicity.

A. DT-ACMO Algorithm for MAS

We employ the ML criterion to determine the code matrices for MAS, then we have to store an $N \times D$ matrix $\boldsymbol{S}$ at the destination node which contains all the possible combinations of the transmitted symbol vectors. The constrained ML optimization problem can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&[\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}[i], \hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]]\\ &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{s}[i], \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]} \|\boldsymbol{r}_{MAS}[i] - \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{MAS}[i]\|^2,\\ &\quad s.t.\ \sum_{k=1}^{n_r} \mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}]\boldsymbol{\Phi}^H_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}]) \leq \mathrm{P_R},\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{MAS}[i] = \sum_{k=1}^{n_r} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}[i]$ denotes the received symbol vector without noise which is determined by substituting each column of $\boldsymbol{S}$ into (6), and $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]$ denotes the $N(\delta_{max}+T) \times NT$ delayed adjustable code matrix at the kth relay node. As mentioned in [7], the optimization algorithm contains a discrete part which refers to the ML detection and a continuous part which refers to the optimization of the adjustable code matrix. The detection and the optimization can be implemented separately as they do not depend on each other. As a result, other detectors such as MMSE and sphere decoders can be used in the detection part in order to reduce the computational complexity. The Lagrangian expression of the optimization problem in (6) is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L} =&\|\boldsymbol{r}_{MAS}[i] - \sum_{k=1}^{n_r} \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}[i]\|^2\\ &+ \lambda(\sum_{k=1}^{n_r} Tr(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Phi}^H_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]) - P_R).\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

After determining the transmitted symbol vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}[i]$ by ML detection, we can calculate the optimal adjustable code matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]$ by employing the RLS estimation algorithm. The adjustable code matrix $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]$ will be updated after a number of iterations and finally achieve its optimum by the RLS estimation algorithm with a reduced computational complexity. The superior convergence behavior of LS type algorithms when the size of the adjustable code matrix is large is the reason for its utilization. It is worth to mention that the computational complexity reduces from cubic to square by employing the RLS algorithm.

In order to derive an RLS algorithm, the optimization problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]] &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]} \sum_{n=1}^{i} \lambda^{i-n}\|\boldsymbol{r}[n] - \hat{\boldsymbol{r}}[i]\|^2,\\ s.t.\ \sum_{k=1}^{n_r} &\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}](\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}])^H[\mathrm{i}]) \leq \mathrm{P_R},\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where λ stands for the forgetting factor. By expanding the right-hand side of (8) and taking the gradient with respect to $(\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i])^*$ and equating the terms to zero, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i] =&(\sum_{n=1}^{i} \lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[n])\\ &(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[n])^{-1},\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where the $N(\lambda_{max}+T) \times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[n] = \boldsymbol{\Delta}_k\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i]$ and $\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[n] = \boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i]$. The power constraint is still not considered during the derivation but is enforced by the normalization strategy after the optimization. We can define

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Psi}[i] &= \sum_{n=1}^{i} \lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[n]\\ &= \lambda\boldsymbol{\Psi}[i-1] + \boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[n],\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{Z}[i] &= \sum_{n=1}^{i} \lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[n]\\ &= \lambda\boldsymbol{Z}[i-1] + \boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[n],\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

so that we can rewrite (9) as

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i] = \boldsymbol{Z}[i]\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i]. \tag{12}$$

By employing the matrix inversion lemma in [25], we can obtain

$$\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i] = \lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i-1] - \lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{k}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i-1], \tag{13}$$

where $\boldsymbol{k}[i] = (\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i-1]\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[i])/(1 + \lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i-1]\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[i])$. We define $\boldsymbol{P}[i] = \boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i]$ and by substituting (11) and (13) into (12), the expression of the code matrix is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]\\ &= \lambda\boldsymbol{Z}[i-1]\boldsymbol{P}[i] + \boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}[i]\\ &= \boldsymbol{Z}[i-1]\boldsymbol{P}[i-1] + \boldsymbol{Z}[i-1]\boldsymbol{k}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}[i-1]\\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}[i]\\ &= \boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i-1]\\ &\quad + \lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[i] - \boldsymbol{Z}[i-1]\boldsymbol{k}[i])\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}[i-1].\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

As mentioned before, a normalization process after (14) is implemented as $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i] = \frac{\sqrt{\mathrm{P_R}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n_r}\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}](\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}])^H)}}$ in order to maintain the energy of the code matrices. The Table

TABLE I
SUMMARY OF THE DT-ACMO RLS ALGORITHM

1:	Initialize: $\boldsymbol{P}[0]=\delta^{-1}\boldsymbol{I}_{N(\lambda_{max}+T)\times N(\lambda_{max}+T)}$,
2:	$\boldsymbol{Z}[0]=\boldsymbol{I}_{N(\lambda_{max}+T)\times N(\lambda_{max}+T)}$,
3:	generate $\boldsymbol{\Phi}[0]$ randomly
4:	with the power constraint.
5:	For each instant of time, i=1, 2, ..., compute
6:	$\boldsymbol{k}[i]=\frac{\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i-1]\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[i]}{1+\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}[i-1]\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{MAS}}[i]}$,
7:	update $\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]$ by (14),
8:	$\boldsymbol{P}[i]=\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{P}[i-1]-\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{k}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}[i-1]$,
9:	$\boldsymbol{Z}[i]=\lambda\boldsymbol{Z}[i-1]+\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{MAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{MAS}}[i]$.
10:	$\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]=\frac{\sqrt{\mathrm{P_R}}\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{eq_{k\,MAS}}[i]}{\sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n_r}\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}](\boldsymbol{\Phi}^{\boldsymbol{\Delta}}_{\mathrm{eq_{kMAS}}}[\mathrm{i}])^H)}}$.

I shows a summary of the DT-ACMO RLS algorithm.

B. DT-ACMO Algorithm for SAS

In SAS model, the main difference of the proposed algorithm is the commotional complexity which is related to the dimension of the adjustable code matrix. We only consider the received symbols from the relay nodes so that the equivalent received vector at the destination node is expressed as

$$\boldsymbol{r}_{SAS}[i]=\sum_{k=1}^{n_r}\boldsymbol{\Delta}_k\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i]+\boldsymbol{n}_{RD}[i], \quad (15)$$

According to the ML criteria, the optimization problem can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}&[\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}[i],\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]]\\&=\arg\min_{\boldsymbol{s}[i],\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]}\|\boldsymbol{r}_{SAS}[i]-\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{SAS}[i]\|^2,\\&s.t.\ \mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{\mathrm{eq_{kSAS}}}[\mathrm{i}]\boldsymbol{\Phi}^H_{\mathrm{eq_{kSAS}}}[\mathrm{i}])\le\mathrm{P_R},\end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{SAS}[i]=\sum_{k=1}^{n_r N}\boldsymbol{\Delta}_k\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}[i]$. After we obtain the most-likely transmitted symbol vector $\hat{\boldsymbol{s}}[i]$ from the source node by ML detection as mentioned in the previous section, the RLS optimization problem is written as

$$\begin{aligned}&[\hat{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]]\\&=\arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]}\sum_{n=1}^{i}\lambda^{i-n}\|\boldsymbol{r}_{SAS}[n]-\hat{\boldsymbol{r}}_{SAS}[i]\|^2.\end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

By expanding the right-hand side of (17) and taking gradient with respect to $(\boldsymbol{\Phi}^*_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i])$ and equaling the terms to zero, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\\&=(\sum_{n=1}^{i}\lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{\Delta}_k\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[n])\\&(\sum_{i=1}^{n}\lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[n])^{-1}.\end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The power constraint is enforced by the normalization strategy after the optimization. We can define

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{SAS}[i]&=\sum_{n=1}^{i}\lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{SAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[n]\\&=\lambda\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{SAS}[i-1]+\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{SAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[n],\end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{Z}_{SAS}[i]&=\sum_{n=1}^{i}\lambda^{i-n}\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{SAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[n]\\&=\lambda\boldsymbol{Z}_{SAS}[i-1]+\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{SAS}}[n]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[n],\end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{SAS}}[n]=\boldsymbol{\Delta}_k\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i]$ and $\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{SAS}}[n]=\boldsymbol{G}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{s}[i]$. Thus, we can rewrite (18) as

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]=\boldsymbol{Z}_{SAS}[i]\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{SAS}[i]. \quad (21)$$

By employing the matrix inversion lemma in [25], we can obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{SAS}[i]=&\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{SAS}[i-1]\\&-\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{k}_{SAS}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{SAS}[i-1],\end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where $\boldsymbol{k}_{SAS}[i]=(\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{SAS}[i-1]\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{SAS}}[i])/(1+\lambda^{-1}\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{SAS}[i-1]\boldsymbol{r}_{k_{SAS}}[i])$. We define $\boldsymbol{P}_{SAS}[i]=\boldsymbol{\Psi}^{-1}_{SAS}[i]$ and by substituting (20) and (22) into (21), the expression of the code matrix is given by

$$\begin{aligned}&\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i]\\&=\lambda\boldsymbol{Z}_{SAS}[i-1]\boldsymbol{P}_{SAS}[i]+\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}_{SAS}[i]\\&=\boldsymbol{Z}_{SAS}[i-1]\boldsymbol{P}_{SAS}[i-1]+\boldsymbol{Z}_{SAS}[i-1]\boldsymbol{k}_{SAS}[i]\\&\ \ \boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}_{SAS}[i-1]+\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}_{SAS}[i]\\&=\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{eq_{k\,SAS}}[i-1]+\lambda^{-1}(\boldsymbol{r}_{e_{SAS}}[i]-\boldsymbol{Z}_{SAS}[i-1]\\&\ \ \boldsymbol{k}_{SAS}[i])\boldsymbol{r}^H_{k_{SAS}}[i]\boldsymbol{P}_{SAS}[i-1].\end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

By using the algorithm in Table I we can obtain the optimal code matrices, and the only differences are the initialized matrices $\boldsymbol{P}[0]=\delta^{-1}\boldsymbol{I}_{N\times N}$, and $\boldsymbol{Z}[0]=\boldsymbol{I}_{N\times N}$ for SAS.

IV. SIMULATIONS

The simulation results are provided in this section to assess the proposed scheme and algorithms. The cooperative MIMO system considered employs AF and DF protocol with the Alamouti STBC scheme in [10] using QPSK modulation in a quasi-static block fading channel with AWGN. The effect of the direct link is also considered. It is possible to employ the different DSTCs with a simple modification. The cooperative MAS equipped with $n_r=1,2$ relay nodes and $N=2$ antennas at each node, while the cooperative SAS employed $N=1,2$ antennas at the source node and the destination node and $n_r=1,2$ relay nodes with single-antenna. In the simulations, we set the symbol power σ_s^2 as equal to 1, and the power of the adjustable code matrix in the DT-ACMO algorithm is normalized. The SNR in the simulations is the received SNR which is calculated by $SNR=\frac{\|\boldsymbol{D}_D[i]\|^2_F}{\|\boldsymbol{n}_D[i]\boldsymbol{n}^H_D[i]\|^2_F}$.

The BER performance of the D-Alamouti, the R-Alamouti in [6] in the cooperative MAS and SAS without delay are shown in Fig. 2. The solid strings are the BER curves without the direct link (DL) and the dashed ones are that with the


N=1 at S, R and D, AF (no DL / DL)
N=2 at S, R and D, DF (no DL / DL)
N=2 at S R and D, n_r=1, AF (no DL / DL)
N=2 at S R and D, n_r=1, AF (no DL / DL)
N=2 at S and D, N=1 at R, n_r=2, AF (no DL / DL)
BER
SNR (dB)

Fig. 2. BER vs. SNR Performance for the SAS and MAS employing the Alamouti Schemes without the Delay Profile



Fig. 3. BER vs. SNR Performance for SAS

DL. The SAS employing single antenna at each node and the AF strategy with and without the DL have the worst BER performance compared with the SAS and MAS employing multiple antennas and relay nodes. The cooperation of the DL helps SAS to achieve a higher diversity gain and lower the BER. In SAS employing $N = 2$ antennas at the source node and the destination node with $n_r = 2$ single-antenna relay nodes, and MAS employing the same number of the antennas at the source node and the destination node with $n_r = 1$ relay node using $N = 2$ antennas, the superposition of the BER curves can be observed. With the cooperation of the DL, a higher order of the diversity can be achieved. The simulation results lead to the conclusion that with the same number of antennas at the source node and the destination node in SAS and MAS, if the number of the relay nodes with single antenna is the same as the number of multi-antenna relay nodes, the same diversity order and BER performance can be achieved when the synchronization is perfect at the relay node.

In Fig. 3, BER curves of different Alamouti coding schemes without the DL using an ML detector are compared in SAS with $N = 2$ relay nodes. The D-Alamouti STBC is employed among the single-antenna relay nodes. The different delay profiles are considered to evaluate the D-Alamouti STBC in SAS. As shown in Fig. 3, the R-Alamouti scheme improves the performance by about 2dB without the DL compared to the D-Alamouti scheme when perfect synchronization is considered. When the delay profile $\mathbf{\Delta} = [0, 1]$ is considered among the relay nodes, it is shown that the D-Alamouti and R-Alamouti are not DT-STCs.

The proposed DT-ACMO algorithm with an ML receiver is compared with different Alamouti schemes in MAS in Fig. 4. It is worth to mention that the delay profiles in the simulations are different. In the proposed algorithm the DF strategy is employed which requires re-encoding at the relay nodes, and the full Alamouti scheme is obtained at each of the $n_r = 2$ relay nodes. The results illustrate that without the DL, by making use of the randomized encoding technique in [6], a 2dB BER performance improvement can be achieved



Fig. 4. BER vs. SNR Performance for DT-ACMO RLS Algorithm for MAS

compared to the D-Alamouti scheme with and without the delay. It is also worth to mention that the DT-ACMO algorithm can be employed in the MAS to achieve a better BER performance as both of algorithms employ DSTCs and can perform the optimization at the destination node. With the consideration of the delay profiles, the results indicate that the diversity order will not reduced, and using the DT-ACMO RLS algorithm an improved performance is achieved with 3dB of gain as compared to employing the RSTC algorithm in [6] and 5dB of gain as compared to employing the traditional DSTBC algorithm. The simulation results illustrate that for MAS with different DSTC schemes when the same delay profiles are considered, a 1dB performance improvement is obtained. It is because when the full DSTC schemes can be obtained at the relay nodes employed in MAS, at the destination node a delayed symbol matrix with increased dimension is received which means the observation window is bigger than that with the non-delayed MAS.

V. Conclusion

We have proposed a delay-tolerant adjustable code matrix optimization (DT-ACMO) algorithm for the cooperative MIMO system using an ML receiver at the destination node to mitigate the effect of the delay associated with the DSTCs from relay nodes. Two types of cooperative systems have been analyzed by comparing the BER of the delayed DSTCs. In order to achieve a better BER performance and eliminate the computation complexity at the destination node, we have proposed the DT-ACMO RLS algorithm. The simulation results illustrate the performance of the two different cooperative systems with the same number of transmit and receive antennas, and the advantage of the proposed DT-ACMO and DT-ACMORO algorithms by comparing them with the cooperative network employing the traditional delayed DSTC scheme and the delayed RSTC scheme. The proposed algorithms can be used with different DSTC schemes and can also be extended to cooperative systems with any number of antennas.

References

[1] J. N. Laneman and G. W. Wornell, "Cooperative Diversity in Wireless Networks: Efficient Protocols and Outage Behaviour", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3062-3080, Dec. 2004.

[2] J. N. Laneman and G. W. Wornell, "Distributed Space-Time-Coded Protocols for Exploiting Cooperative Diversity in Wireless Networks", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2415-2425, Oct. 2003.

[3] T. Wang, R. C. de Lamare, and A. Schmeink, "Joint Linear Receiver Design and Power Allocation Using Alternating Optimization Algorithms for Wireless Sensor Networks," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 61, no. 9, Nov. 2012.

[4] R. C. de Lamare, "Joint iterative power allocation and linear interference suppression algorithms for cooperative DS-CDMA networks", *IET Communications*, vol. 6, no. 13, September 2012.

[5] S. Yiu, R. Schober, L. Lampe, "Distributed Space-Time Block Coding", *IEEE Trans. Wir. Commun.*, vol. 54, no. 7, pp. 1195-1206, Jul. 2006.

[6] B. Sirkeci-Mergen, A. Scaglione, "Randomized Space-Time Coding for Distributed Cooperative Communication", *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, vol. 55, no. 10, Oct. 2007.

[7] T. Peng, R. C. de Lamare and A. Schmeink, "Adaptive Distributed Space-Time Coding Based on Adjustable Code Matrices for Cooperative MIMO Relaying Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 61, no. 7, July 2013.

[8] P. Clarke, R. C. de Lamare, "Joint Transmit Diversity Optimization and Relay Selection for Multi-relay Cooperative MIMO Systems Using Discrete Stochastic Algorithms", *IEEE Communications Letters*, vol. 15, p.p. 1035-1037, Oct. 2011.

[9] P. Clarke ad R. C. de Lamare, "Transmit Diversity and Relay Selection Algorithms for Multi-relay Cooperative MIMO Systems", IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology, vol. 61 , no. 3, March 2012, Page(s): 1084 - 1098.

[10] R. C. de Lamare, R. Sampaio-Neto, "Blind Adaptive MIMO Receivers for Space-Time Block-Coded DS-CDMA Systems in Multipath Channels Using the Constant Modulus Criterion", *IEEE Trans. on Commun.*, vol. 58, no. 1, Jan. 2010.

[11] H. El Gamal and M. O. Damen, "Universal space-time coding", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 1097-1119, May 2003.

[12] M. O. Damen, A. R. Hammons, "Delay-Tolerant Distributed-TAST Codes for Cooperative Diversity", *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 10, pp. 3755-3773, Oct. 2007.

[13] M. Torbatian, M. O. Damen, "On the design of delay-tolerant distributed space-time codes with minimum length", *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 931-939, Feb. 2009.

[14] Z. Zhimeng, Z. Shihua, A. Nallanathan, "Delay-tolerant distributed linear convolutional space-time code with minimum memory length under frequency-selective channels", *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 3944-3949, August 2009.

[15] M. R. Bhatnagar, A. Hjorungnes and M. Debbah, "Delay-tolerant decode-and-forward based cooperative communication over Ricean channels", *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 1277-1282, April 2010.

[16] R.C. de Lamare, R. Sampaio-Neto, "Minimum mean-squared error iterative successive parallel arbitrated decision feedback detectors for DS-CDMA systems", IEEE Trans. Commun., vol. 56, no. 5, May 2008, pp. 778-789.

[17] P. Li and R. D. Murch, "Multiple Output Selection-LAS Algorithm in Large MIMO Systems", IEEE Commun. Lett., vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 399-401, May 2010.

[18] R. C. de Lamare, "Adaptive and Iterative Multi-Branch MMSE Decision Feedback Detection Algorithms for Multi-Antenna Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 14, no. 2, February 2013.

[19] R. C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Adaptive reduced-rank processing based on joint and iterative interpolation, decimation, and filtering," IEEE Trans. Signal Process., vol. 57, no. 7, July 2009, pp. 2503-2514.

[20] R.C. de Lamare and R. Sampaio-Neto, "Adaptive reduced-rank equalization algorithms based on alternating optimization design techniques for MIMO systems," IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol., vol. 60, no. 6, pp. 2482-2494, July 2011.

[21] J. W. Choi, A. C. Singer, J Lee, N. I. Cho, "Improved linear soft-input soft-output detection via soft feedback successive interference cancellation," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol.58, no.3, pp.986-996, March 2010.

[22] P. Li, R. C. de Lamare and R. Fa, "Multiple Feedback Successive Interference Cancellation Detection for Multiuser MIMO Systems," *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 10, no. 8, pp. 2434-2439, August 2011.

[23] P. Li and R. C. de Lamare, "Adaptive Decision-Feedback Detection With Constellation Constraints for MIMO Systems", *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, vol. 61, no. 2, 853-859, 2012.

[24] S. Haykin, *Adaptive Filter Theory*, $4th$ ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall, 2002.

[25] D. J. Tylavsky, G. R. L. Sohie., "Generalization of the matrix inversion lemma", *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 74, no. 7, pp. 1050-1052, July 1986.